

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/057,546 01/25/2002		Alfred Ebbinghaus	02-139	3046		
7590 . 04/04/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER		
Gregory P. LaPointe			KUHNS, A	KUHNS, ALLAN R		
Bachman & Lal	Pointe, P.C.					
900 Chapel Street, Suite 1201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
New Haven, CT 06510-2802			1732			
.,.,,,			72 4 777 4 4 4 4 7 C12 0 4 10 4 10 0 0	_		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					i/\			
		Applic	ation No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/05	7,546	EBBINGHAUS, AL	EBBINGHAUS, ALFRED			
		Exami	ner	Art Unit				
		Allan K		1732				
The MAILII Period for Reply	NG DATE of this communic	ation appears on	the cover sheet with th	e correspondence ad	dress			
THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time ma after SIX (6) MONTHS - If the period for reply si - Failure to reply within the properiod for reply within the properiod by received by	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR ATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, by be available under the provisions of from the mailling date of this community pecified above is less than thirty (30) of a specified above, the maximum status the set or extended period for reply with the Office later than three months after justment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ication. days, a reply within the ory period will apply an I, by statute, cause the	o event, however, may a reply bo statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr application to become ABANDC	e timely filed days will be considered timely rom the mailing date of this co	r. Immunication.			
Status								
1) Responsive	to communication(s) filed	on <i>06 Januar</i> y 2	005					
2a) This action	• •		This action is non-final.					
3)☐ Since this a	_							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claim	S							
4a) Of the all 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>17</u> 7) ☐ Claim(s)	Claim(s) <u>17-26 and 29</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
Application Papers								
9) The specific	ation is objected to by the E	Examiner.						
10) The drawing))☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	y not request that any objection							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S		-						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachment(s)			·					
1) Notice of References		0.10)	4) Interview Summa					
	n's Patent Drawing Review (PTO e Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT e		Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Date al Patent Application (PTO	-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/057,546 Page 2

Art Unit: 1732

1. The designation "previously presented" for claim 29 appears to be incorrect at this time.

- 2.Claims 17-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The aspect in claims 17 and 18 that the at least partially hollow formed part is "non-slotted" lacks support in the disclosure as filed. In addition, the aspect in claim 29 that the process requires "chemical bonding between the foamed metal and the outer part by forming an alloy between the metal foam material and the material of an inner region of the outer hollow part" also lacks support in the disclosure as filed.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17, 18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al. (3,087,807) as set forth in the previous Office action.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.Claims 18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiedler et al. (2,979,392) in view of Niebylski et al. (3,873,392) as set forth in the previous Office action.

6.Applicant's arguments filed January 6, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the disclosure in Allen et al. at column 4, lines 52-62 sets forth the requirement for a thin slotted metal tube in order to avoid forming a radiation shield, and that the instant claims have been amended to distinguish over Allen et al. by requiring that the external formed part be "non-slotted". This is not persuasive because Allen et al. only teach at column 4, lines 55-56 that the combination of a rod of sufficient susceptibility (apparently to induction heating) and athin slotted metal tube is "ideal". Allen et al. do not state that a non-slotted external formed part would be unusable. This is particularly so because Allen et al. view the use of slotted, thin wall cylinders or tubes in the context of induction heating, but the instant claims are "open" with regard how heating is accomplished and/or how blowing agent is activated.

With regard to Fiedler et al., applicant argues that this patent 'teaches a process wherein "he" is only able to foam in a molten state which is quite different from the powder forming process claimed in independent claim 18. This is not persuasive because the relevant portion of independent claim 18 requires only "introducing into the hollow external formed part foam material and blowing agent; and activating the blowing agent so that there is formed in the external foamed part an open-cell or closed-cell metal foam with high resistance to deformation ...". Applicant also argues that there is no suggestion in Fiedler et al. as to how to use a precursor material in a closed hollow

Art Unit: 1732

tube. But Fiedler et al. teach at column 3, lines 55-56 that a suitable hollow article would include a hollow pipeor other suitable hollow object which could be filled with metal foam.

7.Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Kuhns whose telephone number is (571) 272-1202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/057,546

Art Unit: 1732

Page 5

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALLAN R. KUHNS PRIMARY EXAMINER AU 1732

3-30-05